

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,869	12/28/2000	Sunil H. Contractor	BELL-0048/00124	7435
38952	7590	09/09/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ELAHEE, MD S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2645		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/749,869	CONTRACTOR ET AL.
	Examiner Md S Elahee	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed 05/13/04. Claims 1 and 3-38 are pending. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments mailed on 05/13/04 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, 21-25, 28, 32-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478).

Regarding claim 1, Devillier teaches placing a call (i.e., first telephone call) from the calling party directed to the subscriber via the switching network (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.2, lines 42-44, col.5, lines 23-26; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches placing a second call (i.e., second telephone call) from IP (i.e., services node) to the subscriber (col.3, lines 14-21, col.4, lines 37-40, col.5, lines 53-56; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

However, it is not clear whether Devillier teaches “replacing a telephone directory number associated with the services node with a telephone directory number associated with the first telephone station”. Shepherd teaches replacing a telephone directory number associated with the services node with a telephone directory number associated with the calling party (i.e., first telephone station) (fig.10; col.10, lines 39-50). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier to incorporate the feature of replacing a telephone directory number associated with the services node with a telephone directory number associated with the first telephone station as taught by Shepherd. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to deliver the correct calling party number to the called party.

Devillier further teaches determining line information associated with the calling party number from a database stored at a services control point (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 50-61, col.5, lines 53-56; ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber via the second call (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 14-21, 50-65, col.4, lines 37-40, 50-61; ‘announcing’ reads on the claim ‘communicating’, ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 3, Devillier teaches providing an audible announcement to the subscriber requesting a desired response identifying whether to accept or reject the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘providing’ reads on the claim ‘transmitting’, ‘announcement’ reads on the claim ‘message’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘desired response’ reads on the claim ‘response’).

Regarding claim 4, Devillier teaches notifying from the subscriber a message identifying whether to accept or reject the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘notifying’ reads on the claim ‘receiving’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘message’ reads on the claim ‘signal’).

Regarding claim 5, Devillier teaches connecting the calling party and the subscriber if the subscriber accepts the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches ending the call if the subscriber rejects the call (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘ending’ reads on the claim ‘terminating’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 6, Devillier teaches connecting the calling party with the voice mail of the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’, ‘voice mail’ reads on the claim ‘voice mailbox’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 8, Devillier teaches receiving information associated with the calling party and inherently with the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.2, lines

42-44; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 10, Devillier teaches retrieving a name associated with the owner of the caller line (abstract; fig.1; col.3, lines 50-65; ‘owner of the caller line’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Devillier teaches at the service switching point, placing a call (i.e., first telephone call) from the calling party to the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.2, lines 42-44, col.5, lines 23-26; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the service switching point, initiating a query to the service control point to identify the IP to place a second call to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42, col.5, lines 53-56; ‘initiating a query’ reads on the claim ‘forwarding a request’, ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘one of the plurality of services nodes’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the service control point, identifying the IP to place a second call to the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42, col.5, lines 53-56; ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘one of the plurality of services nodes’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the IP identified by the service control point, initiating a query to the service control point to provide information associated with the calling party to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘initiating a query’ reads on the claim ‘forwarding a request’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the service control point, identifying information associated with the calling party from a database on the service control point (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the IP identified by the service control point, receiving the information associated with the calling party from the service control point (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that at the IP, placing the second call to the subscriber and audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 50-61, col.5, lines 53-56; ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’, ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 13, Devillier teaches that information identifying the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 14, Devillier teaches that querying a database using information identifying the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 15, Devillier teaches a request from the subscriber to accept the call from the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 16, Devillier teaches a request from the subscriber to reject the call from the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘notifying’ reads on the claim ‘receiving’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Devillier teaches that a service switching point, in communication with the calling party, the service switching point adapted to place a call (i.e., first telephone call) from the calling party to the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.2, lines 25-44, col.5, lines 23-26; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier further teaches that a IP communicating with the service switching point, the IP adapted to place a second call to the subscriber and audibly announce the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract;

fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 25-42, 50-61, col.5, lines 53-56; 'IP' reads on the claim 'services node', 'line information' reads on the claim 'information', 'calling party' reads on the claim 'first telephone station' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Devillier further teaches that a services control point communicating with the service switching point and the IP and having a database including information associated with the calling party wherein the IP receives the information associated with the calling party from the service control point and communicates an audible announcement of the line information to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.3, lines 50-65, col.4, lines 25-42, 50-61; 'IP' reads on the claim 'services node', 'line information' reads on the claim 'information' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Regarding claim 22, Devillier teaches that the service control point, upon receipt of a request from the service switching point, queries a database and identifies a IP adapted to connect the calling party and the subscriber (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; 'IP' reads on the claim 'services node', 'calling party' reads on the claim 'first telephone station' and 'subscriber' reads on the claim 'second telephone station').

Regarding claim 24, Devillier teaches that the identified IP initiates a query to the service control point requesting information concerning the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; 'IP' reads on the

claim ‘services node’, ‘initiates a query’ reads on the claim ‘sends a message’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 25, Devillier further teaches that the service control point queries the database and returns information concerning the calling party to the IP (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 28, Devillier further teaches that the service control point queries the database and returns information concerning the calling party to the IP (fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 32, Devillier teaches teaches a request the subscriber to accept or reject the call from the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Regarding claim 33, Devillier teaches connecting the calling party and the subscriber if the subscriber accepts the call and the IP connecting the caller with the called party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 34, Devillier teaches ending the call if the subscriber rejects the call and the services node terminating the caller with the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4;

col.3, lines 37-49, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘ending’ reads on the claim ‘terminating’, ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’ and ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 35, Devillier further teaches sending the caller to the voice mail of the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49; ‘sending the caller’ reads on the claim ‘directs the call from the first telephone station’, ‘voice mail’ reads on the claim ‘voice mailbox’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Regarding claim 37, Devillier teaches that the IP upon receipt of a request from the subscriber to accept the call from the calling party, connects the caller with the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.3, lines 37-49, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

5. Claims 7 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478) and further in view of Griffiths et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,481,602).

Regarding claim 7, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “continuing to send a ringing signal to the first telephone station until a ring timer expires”. Griffiths teaches playing ringing to the calling party until a timer expires (abstract; col.2, lines 1-20; ‘playing ringing’ reads on the claim ‘continuing to send a ringing signal’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘ring timer’ reads on the claim ‘timer’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a ring timer as

taught by Griffiths. The motivation for the modification is to have the ring timer in order to provide the calling party more time having the chance to get connected with the called party.

Regarding claim 36, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “continues to transmit a ringing signal to the first telephone station until a ring timer expires”. Griffiths teaches playing ringing to the calling party until a timer expires (abstract; col.2, lines 1-20; ‘playing ringing’ reads on the claim ‘continues to transmit a ringing signal’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘ring timer’ reads on the claim ‘timer’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a ring timer as taught by Griffiths. The motivation for the modification is to have the ring timer in order to provide the calling party more time having the chance to get connected with the called party.

6. Claims 9, 17 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478) and further in view of Madoch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,409).

Regarding claim 9, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the information associated with the first telephone station”. Madoch teaches at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number (fig.4; col.4, lines 30-49; ‘the originating number’ reads on the claim ‘the information associated with the first telephone station’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a query a second service control point as taught by Madoch. The motivation for the modification is to have the query a second service control point in order to provide the information associated with the calling party.

Regarding claim 17, Devillier in view of Shepherd teaches initiating a query to the database for the information associated with the calling party (abstract; fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘initiates a query’ reads on the claim ‘sends a message’ and ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’).

Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “if no information is found in the database at the service control point, querying at least another service control point for the information associated with the first telephone station”. Madoch teaches if no information is found in the database at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number (fig.4; col.4, lines 30-49; ‘a second service control point’ reads on the claim ‘at least another service control point’ and ‘the originating number’ reads on the claim ‘the information associated with the first telephone station’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a query a second service control point as taught by Madoch. The motivation for the modification is to have the query a second service control point in order to provide the information associated with the calling party.

Devillier in view of Shepherd further teaches that at the service control point, sending the information associated with the calling party to the services node (abstract;

fig.1, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 58-67, col.2, lines 1-6, 42-44, col.4, lines 25-42; ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and IP’ reads on the claim ‘services node’).

Regarding claim 27, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “said service control point queries at least a second service control point for information associated with the first telephone station”. Madoch teaches the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number (fig.4; col.4, lines 30-49; ‘the originating number’ reads on the claim ‘the information associated with the first telephone station’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a query a second service control point as taught by Madoch. The motivation for the modification is to have the query a second service control point in order to provide the information associated with the calling party.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478) and further in view of Malik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,875).

Regarding claim 12, Devillier in view of Shepherd further fails to teach “retrieving at least more than 15 characters of data from said database”. Malik teaches retrieving at least more than 15 characters of data from the database (col.3, lines 13-26, col.8, lines 57-67, col.9, lines 1-21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow more than 15 characters of data as taught by Malik. The motivation for the modification

is to have more than 15 characters of data from the database in order to provide information about the calling party as well as the called party.

8. Claims 18-20 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478) and further in view of Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,809).

Regarding claim 18, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “converting textual information to audible signals”. Bossemeyer teaches converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-6; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible signals’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

Regarding claim 19, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “converting textual information to audible signals by means of computer-generated sounds”. Bossemeyer teaches converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format by means of pre-processor (abstract; fig.3, fig.4; col.3, lines 16-20, col.4, lines 17-28; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible signals’ and ‘pre-processor’ reads on the claim ‘computer-generated sounds’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a conversion as

taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

Regarding claims 20 and 31, Devillier in view of Shepherd teaches playing announcements (col.4, lines 36-39; ‘announcements’ reads on the claim ‘pre-recorded speech files’).

Regarding claim 29, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “the services node converts the information associated with the first telephone station to an audible message”. Bossemeyer teaches converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-6; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’ and ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible signals’).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

Regarding claim 30, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “the audible message is computer-generated”. Bossemeyer teaches the text-to-speech format by means of pre-processor (abstract; fig.3, fig.4; col.3, lines 16-20, col.4, lines 17-28; ‘caller information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘text-to-speech format’ reads on the claim ‘audible message’ and ‘pre-processor’ reads on the claim ‘computer-generated’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a conversion as taught by Bossemeyer. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide a change in data from one format to another format.

9. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478) and further in view of Dugan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,411).

Regarding claim 23, Devillier in view of Shepherd teaches audibly announcing the line information associated with the calling party number to the subscriber (abstract; fig.1, fig.2, fig.3, fig.4, fig.5; col.1, lines 59-65, col.3, lines 50-67, col.4, lines 1-13, 50-61; ‘line information’ reads on the claim ‘information’, ‘calling party’ reads on the claim ‘first telephone station’ and ‘subscriber’ reads on the claim ‘second telephone station’).

Devillier in view of Shepherd further fails to teach “a signal is detected”. Dugan teaches that DTMF tones is detected in response to system prompts (col.70, lines 11-30; ‘DTMF tones’ reads on the claim ‘signal’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a signal detection as taught by Dugan. The motivation for the modification is to have the detection in order to provide a request for the information associated with the calling party.

10. Claims 26 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435) and in view of Shepherd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,478) and further in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,533).

Regarding claims 26 and 38, Devillier in view of Shepherd fails to teach “at least more than 50 characters of data”. Cox teaches retrieving at least 50 characters of information from the database (abstract; col.2, lines 49-67, col.17, lines 50-67, col.18, lines 1-67; ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘data’). Thus, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Devillier in view of Shepherd to allow a 50 characters of data as taught by Cox. The motivation for the modification is to have the higher data length in order to provide enough space for the user's name.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ghisler (U.S. Patent No. 5,953,657) teach Method and arrangement for call setup in telecommunications networks using signaling aided redialing.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

September 5, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

